

collections of "*T. spicatum*" of Ecuador, Peru and Bolivia of the U. S. Nat. Herbarium of Washington. *T. oreophilum* is more closely related (by its villous lemma and its habit) to *T. Rosei* than to *T. spicatum*, as the writer sees them after a careful study of the type (Cf. discussion of the type of *T. spicatum*).

(*To be continued*)

SOLIDAGO FLEXICAULIS AND SOLIDAGO LATIFOLIA

KENNETH K. MACKENZIE

IN 1753 (Sp. Pl. 2: 879) Linnaeus published his *Solidago flexicaulis* and immediately following on the same page his *Solidago latifolia*.

His description of *Solidago flexicaulis* is as follows:

"7. SOLIDAGO caule flexuoso, foliis ovatis acuminatis serratis, racemis lateralibus simplicibus. *Roy. lugdb.* 161.

"Virga aurea montana, scrophulariae folio. *Pluk. alm.* 390. t. 235. f. 3.

"Virga aurea canadensis, asterisci folio. *Herm. par.* 244. t. 244.

"*Habitat in Canada.*"

Both plates cited illustrate the plant treated by Britton & Brown (Ill. Fl. (ed. 2) 3: 383 f. 4216) as *Solidago flexicaulis*, and the Royen reference refers to the same plant. Notwithstanding that Linnaeus in no way referred to or cited any herbarium specimen of his own, Gray (Proc. Am. Acad. 17: 178-9. 1882) insisted on dropping the name, merely because he found a specimen of *Solidago caesia* L. labeled as *S. flexicaulis* in the Linnaean herbarium. And this although the Linnaean herbarium is full of incorrectly labeled material. Since Gray's time it has developed that the specimen seen by him was not in the Linnaean herbarium in 1753 (Jackson, Proc. Linnaean Soc. 1912, Supplement 139) and hence it has no claim at all for consideration in dealing with *Solidago flexicaulis*. The name then is properly used as by Britton & Brown and the species represents no mixture at all.

The original description of *Solidago latifolia* is as follows:

"8. SOLIDAGO caule erecto, foliis ovatis acuminatis serratis, racemis lateralibus simplicibus.

"Virga aurea, latissimo folio, canadensis glabra. *Pluk. alm.* 389. t. 235. f. 4.

"*Habitat in Canada.* 4

“*Nimis affinis S. flexicauli. Caulis rectus acute angulatus. Folia ovata, utrinque mucronata, serrata, supra laevia, subtus scabra. Racemi ex alis, folio plerumque breviores.*”

This is a real mixture. The specimen in the Linnaean herbarium (labeled *lateriflora* by Linnaeus and corrected to *latifolia* by Smith) is a cultivated non-typical form of the plant treated as *S. latifolia* in the seventh edition of Gray's Manual (p. 789). The Linnaean description also applies to this. The Plukenet reference however applies to something entirely different (Gray, Proc. Am. Acad. **17**: 178-9. 1882).

From the above it follows that the names *Solidago flexicaulis* and *Solidago latifolia* both apply to the same plant. Under the American code of nomenclature *Solidago flexicaulis* having place priority should be used. The Vienna code (Art. 46) provides “when two or more groups of the same nature are united * * * if the names are of the same date, the author chooses, and his choice cannot be modified by subsequent authors.”¹

In the present case the earliest author to combine the two names so far found by me was Aiton (Hort. Kew. **3**: 217. 1789), who united them under the name *Solidago flexicaulis*. Later on Willdenow (Sp. Pl. **3**: 2064. 1800) did the same thing, treating *Solidago latifolia* as a variety of *Solidago flexicaulis*.

Solidago flexicaulis then is the name which should be applied to this species. It is happily a highly appropriate name, and is much to be preferred to a name based on cultivated non-typical material.

MAPLEWOOD, NEW JERSEY.

SOME EASTERN AMERICAN FORMS OF SENECEO

M. L. FERNALD

IN 1924 I noted² the fact that practically all our native species of *Senecio* in northeastern America have both radiate and discoid forms. It was not then considered worth while to give the exceptional

¹ This is as troublesome a rule to apply as could possibly be devised. Its application requires hunting through all the authors whose names may occur to one, in order to find out who first united the groups. One may very easily overlook some author, or some works may not be accessible for examination. Libraries where such investigation can be carried on are very few in number, and the requisite knowledge of what books to look through in each case belongs to very few. The simple rule of the American code is infinitely the best in cases like the present where only two specific names are involved and there is no reason for a different course.

² Fernald, RHODORA, xxvi. 117, in note (1924).